



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Viewed as a whole these volumes present an essentially truthful, although not a complete, account of the internal development of the colonies. Their chief deficiency is in their failure to adequately present their history in relation to the rest of the empire. The final judgments of Mr. Doyle's history, we believe, will pronounce it a highly useful but not a scientific and indispensable work.

HERMAN V. AMES.

*University of Pennsylvania.*

---

**McBain, H. L.** *DeWitt Clinton and the Origin of the Spoils System in New York.* Pp. 161. Price, \$1.50. New York: Macmillan Company, 1907.

The name of DeWitt Clinton is usually connected with all that is debasing and corrupt in the distribution of patronage in New York. With his advent to power in the politics of his state by the turn of fortune in 1801, he is charged with cleaning all the offices of federalists to make way for republicans, that for his own self-interest the adherents of rivals within his own party were excluded, and that he was guilty of nepotism. From such imputations it is the express purpose of this paper to clear the name of DeWitt Clinton. It is a curious fact that at least half a dozen scholars and historians of eminence and ability have uttered these charges without any regard to the story the source material might tell. And this source material has not been inaccessible.

This monograph is based on the manuscript files and minutes of the council of appointment in whose hands lay the patronage of New York, also on the public papers of both George and DeWitt Clinton, on the legislative journals with a judicious use of contemporary newspapers and pamphlets. To show what precedent there was, and to what extent DeWitt Clinton departed from precedent, an account is given not only of the history of civil service in the state prior to 1801, but also in the national government.

The writer clearly shows by adequate evidence that in both state and nation "every feature of DeWitt Clinton's plan of parceling out the patronage of the state found some authority in the practice which had preceded him" (p. 13). In New York State the federalist council of appointment under Governor George Clinton practiced a policy of exclusion toward opponents and a similar policy was adopted when the federalists rose to power under Jay in 1795. In 1801 the republicans were victorious in both state and national elections only to find all the offices in the hands of their political opponents. It was inevitable that with a change of party should come a change in office holding. DeWitt Clinton practiced no new system in using the patronage for party ends. It had been an inveterate practice of English politics.

Further, the evidence plainly shows that DeWitt Clinton did not exclude all political opponents. His policy was to grant the larger offices to republicans, and to divide the smaller between the parties in proportion to their respective numbers, and this plan was put into practice. Neither did he exclude the adherents of Burr, but places were found for some of this rival's closest adherents. On the charge of nepotism it is curious to note

the writer shows that in every case where his relations held office, it was by election and not by appointment. Besides setting the fame of DeWitt Clinton in a new light, the monograph is also valuable as giving a splendid account of the early development of civil service in both national and state government. In point of style and lucidity the writer is to be commended. It is readable, a quality which cannot always be predicated of a doctoral dissertation.

WINFRED TREXLER ROOT.

*University of Pennsylvania.*

---

**Osgood, H. L.** *The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century.* Vol. III. Pp. xxii, 551. Price, \$3.00. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1907.

In the first two volumes, which appeared several years ago, Professor Osgood related the story of the plantation of the colonies and of their development to a period near the close of the seventeenth century. He took particular pains to distinguish between the corporate and proprietary form of colony, making the distinction clearer, perhaps, than any previous writer had done. The sub-title of the present volume, "Imperial Control," indicates that the point of view now shifts to the other side of the sea.

The first chapter is devoted to the organs of imperial control. In point of law there was no distinction between the realm and the dominions, but the differences in fact were very great. Newly discovered lands vested in the crown, hence the regulation of colonies seemed to be a matter of prerogative. On the other hand, Parliament, being jealous of the prerogative, was some times disposed to take a part, but did not in fact pass more than half a dozen laws for the colonies during this period, and these related to trade. The colonists, acknowledging submission to the mother country, were between two fires. If they denied the prerogative of the crown, they were in danger of falling under the dominion of Parliament.

The development of the imperial system was somewhat slow and irregular. For this there were two reasons, the remoteness of the colonies, and the irregular method of their plantation; and the disturbances in English politics. But, throughout it all the influence of the mercantile idea, that colonies must subserve the material interests of the mother country, is unmistakable. Gradually the policy of bringing the colonies under one system, that of the royal province, and of unifying the control, began to develop. This was not, as some historians have maintained, merely a part of the Stuart policy to rule arbitrarily so much as a matter of convenience in enforcing the trade regulations at the entrepôt of the London merchants. The trade acts were not altogether inimical to the colonies, but on the whole, they would have been detrimental if rigidly enforced. The crucial test came in the attempt to consolidate New York and New England and enforce the acts there. But the Stuart throne was already tottering, and with its fall the imperial system for the colonies practically collapsed for the time being.

Nearly all historians state that the trade acts were not designed to